



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

peace. You have in these conferences written your name high on the roll of the world's leaders in the cause of peace, and when the time comes, as it will come, when the nations shall learn war no more, when peace shall prevail, people will look back at the heroes of the great cause and Albert Smiley's name will be way toward the top. Personally, I thank you for the privilege I have had of coming here the last few years. I have gone away from every one of these conferences with a new inspiration, feeling more and more the solemn duty resting upon me in my humble way to do whatever I can for the cause of international peace. And I venture the assertion that of all this great gathering here, everyone goes away with the feeling that you have inspired him or her to greater faithfulness in this noble work. I crown you with the laurel of "The Great Leader of Peace!"

The Press and the Cause of International Peace.

BY ROLLO OGDEN, EDITOR OF THE "NEW YORK EVENING POST."

Address at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 22, 1908.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: In spite of the chairman's complimentary allusion, for which I express my acknowledgments for myself and the newspaper for which I work, I still cannot but feel, in common with every other newspaper man present at this Conference, I presume, that I find myself in a position which is defensive, or at least apologetic, almost as much so as the navy, Admiral Chadwick! [Admiral Chadwick: No, I make no apology for the navy.]

In the midst of all the instruction and stimulus to be derived from the proceedings and addresses of this Conference, there has been one note sounded which could not but fall rather reproachfully upon the ear of any one connected with the press; it has been audible in the remarks of missionaries and clergymen, lawyers and statesmen, university presidents, and there was even in the address of the Japanese ambassador this morning a delicate and veiled allusion to irresponsible critics, which I suppose looked at the press. The sentiment I refer to is, either tacitly implied or openly expressed, that the modern journalism, the newspaper of to-day, is to be counted among the chief enemies of the peace of the world, and indeed the very order of your program here, the placing of us editors at the final meeting, seems to me to wear something of the air of a court proceeding, wherein, after presenting indictment and piling up evidence, you call upon us to make the best defense possible. Indeed, a very sensitive and conscience-stricken journalist might feel that this was the solemn moment when the Conference bade us rise and answer the question, "What have you to say why sentence of death shall not be pronounced upon you?"

Well, ladies and gentlemen, there is little for us to do, I think, but to cast ourselves upon the mercy of the court. We must confess, if we are honest, that the freedom of the press has not in all particulars worked out as its early champions hoped. It was expected to bind nations together. Too often, unfortunately, it has helped the setting of nations against each other. The press, when free and cheap and universal, was expected to represent reason and humanity in its treatment of inter-

national relations; but not seldom, I am sorry to say, it has made itself the instigator and the vehicle of international hatred. Now I am here to say that when that work is done deliberately, no expression of abhorrence or loathing for it can be too severe. I know of no roll less worthy of a man and more fitting to a fiend than that of a newspaper which sets itself to provoke hostility and to precipitate war between nations that ought to live together in peace. Compared with that, I consider poisoning innocent and honorable. And your true war-breathing editor is a combination of cowardice and greed; he takes precious good care that his own carcass be kept out of the danger, but expects to count something out of the blood of soldiers and sailors, and out of widows and orphans, so that if there be war, he applauds the excitement, but his only part in it is like that of one of those infamous creatures who haunt great battlefields after fall of night, to rob the wounded and rifle the pockets of the dead, to fill his own.

Now, my friends, having spoken thus openly of those misguided newspaper men and those unfortunate types which are a terror to civilization and a disgrace to their own profession, you will not accuse me of withholding the truth or speaking with undue partiality when I go on to say that after all a great deal of the inflammatory course of the newspaper in the discussion of foreign relations does not spring from pure malice; it arises partly from a perverted conception of what the function of a newspaper ought to be, and it arises also from false standards of what is interesting and what is important. And those false standards, I beg you to notice, are shared as much by the readers as by the conductors of a newspaper. Unfortunately, as our poor human nature goes, crime is regarded as more exciting than humdrum virtue; so war is more exciting than peace, international quarrels more exciting than adjustment through arbitration; and as there exists this feeling in the conductors of newspapers responding to the popular appetite which calls for excitement, you are to remember that much that seems wicked and cruel may be after all not the desire of the proprietor of the newspaper to induce war, but the desire to give its readers something which they will think to be sensational. When you consider this, when you consider this temptation, I think you will be inclined to be somewhat more charitable than you are to even those editors who, instead of offering olive branches among nations, are given to throwing firebrands.

My friends, I have been thinking to-day of a test that might be applied to this Peace Conference here respecting this matter, out of which I am not quite sure how we should all come. Suppose that when we broke up to-night the door yonder should be thronged by newsboys carrying extra editions of newspapers with startling headlines, announcing as a tremendous sensation that the pending arbitration treaty with Japan had been ratified by the Senate. Now, how many of you would fail to say that such a ridiculous splurge over an unimportant event was simply a foolish thing to do? On the other hand, suppose that when we went out the newsboys had a huge bundle of papers containing the telegrams, and among them those that stated there had been an armed collision in Honolulu between the Japanese and the Americans, and a dispatch stating that the Japanese fleet had sailed. How many papers do you think the boys would have

left? How much talk of war would be heard all over the place, even in this home of peace? Why, I am afraid that the Peace Conference itself would be almost dissolved by such a war scare.

Now I am not speaking of this fostering of international prejudice and excitement to excuse it, but I am endeavoring to explain it, to show the nature of the temptation into which thoughtless editors, dependent upon their sales and upon their counting-room, so easily fall. I do say that, whatever the motives or whatever the purpose, such continued excitements between nations are dangerous. And of this opinion I find very ample confirmation in the reading of the recent biography of John T. Delane, who for so many years was editor of the *London Times*, from 1841 to 1877. That is a very striking biography and has its bearing, first, I will say, upon the beginnings of a great newspaper, and its beginnings, like the origin of most of us, have shaped its future in a very marked way. You all know how the *London Times* of last year was pouring out cynicism and misrepresentation upon the Hague Conference. You all know the unfortunate position which it has taken in regard to the relation between Germany and England, and other very critical foreign affairs. I speak of this to show that a paper need not be in its method sensational to be harmful, because the *Times* has been a highly respectable paper, because it keeps the police news and the ordinary run of crime reduced to the minimum and its pages are very clean and respectable. But it has been a very harmful influence in all that relates to the peaceful settlement of international disputes, if I may say so; partly mixing my metaphors, but not my colors—it is not necessary that one should be yellow in order to be read!

Now the great rise of the *London Times* under Mr. Delane occurred at a time when England, under the leadership of Lord Palmerston in particular, was entering upon a course of continual meddling in the affairs of Europe. Time and again the country was brought to the verge of war. Throughout it all the Ministry was using the newspaper; the editor was in constant touch with the Foreign Secretary, gaining information from him and making an adroit insinuation or dangerous utterance, which was all the while bringing the country to the verge of war. Well, the thing went so far at one time that Lord Palmerston himself had to write a letter of protest to Mr. Delane, which appears in this biography, in which he warned him that of course he understood that his paper must live upon excitement, but that these continual excitements as between nations might easily run into exaggeration and friction and danger and, if continued, might run into war; and he bade him make some effort in the cause of peace. Of course it was the *London Times* which was probably the greatest single influence in bringing the English people to embark upon the Crimean War, as Mr. Kinglake has said in a brilliant chapter in his "Invasion of the Crimea." It was the continual insistence of the *Times*, the great representative English newspaper, the great organ of the middle classes of English opinion, that the safety of England never could be secured until the Russian power on the Black Sea was broken. It was that which finally, in spite of the protests and appeals of John Bright and Mr. Gladstone, and even of the Prime Minister himself, Lord Aberdeen, plunged England into that needless and

miserable war. I say needless war, because forty years later Lord Salisbury himself stood up in the House of Lords and said it was all a mistake, and that England in that bloody and costly and direful war had put her money on the wrong horse!

The point that I am trying to make is that even in that case Mr. Delane affirmed (and I presume with a great deal of truth) that he was speaking not of his own judgment alone, but that he was giving the opinion of the middle class of England, the great non-Conformist groups, the pious, God-fearing English men and women, whose desires he endeavored to ascertain and whose wishes he sought to express. I presume there was a great deal of truth in that; and that thought brings us back afresh to the need of a change of emphasis, not only in the conductors of newspapers, but in those who purchase them, a change of emphasis and a new test as to what is important, and what ought to be magnified and and what ought to be made the basis of appeal and representation. We need a new standard of what is thrilling, of what is exciting, of what is glorious. Why, the Emperor Napoleon himself, who (if any man ever did) tore out the heart of military glory all for himself, felt vaguely in his time that France was too much carried away with military obsession, and he made the suggestion—which I do not know was ever carried out, but it was a fruitful suggestion—that there ought to be individuals in search of goodness, reporters sent out to run down acts of peace; trained journalists seeking for the exclusive news about triumphs and achievements of peace. Something of that sort is coming to-day. Something of that sort has come. We have our glorification of the heroes of peace, and we ought to have more, and we will have more. But the thing to aim at is such a change of mental habit, such a change of general temper, as will create a new atmosphere about the journalist and will bring to bear upon him a new popular demand to which he cannot fail to respond.

I recall with interest a little incident in our own office three years ago, at the time of the signing of the treaty of peace between Russia and Japan at Portsmouth. It happened that the first news came just after twelve o'clock. Now in the afternoon we usually expect, as a matter of custom, a little lull in receiving news, and at twelve o'clock the telegraph operator goes out to lunch and nothing is expected for half an hour. At that moment the operator was out of the office, but it happened that a young man was there who read the telegraph by sound. He heard the ticking which told him that a treaty had been attained and that the news would soon come in the bulletins; he went about the office crying out, "We have a treaty! There is peace!" Well, that incident I won't exaggerate; it was primarily no doubt a sort of professional elation over the early receipt of exclusive news. But after all, my friends, it was in its way a sort of precursor of that wave of joy and pride which spread over this land when we learned that the great instrument of peace had been signed in our country and at the prompting of our government.

If we were only able to make such thrill and excitement at the laying down of arms as that and have such a thorough ecstasy at a great achievement of peace, if we could make it not the infrequent thing but the usual thing, not the exceptional thing but the typical thing, we

should soon bring about a general temper and a changed habit of mind, which in these respects are the necessary prerequisites to a better press. For, my friends, imagination still rules the world. If our thoughts are bloody, our words and deeds will be also. But if we train ourselves to make our deepest interest, our brightest hopes, our fondest aspirations centre about the march of the world to higher achievements of peace in beneficence, why then wars will cease among men, because men will cease to think about wars, and we shall come to peace as a settled and constant presupposition of our lives — peace being the light of all our seeing, the master light of all our day.

The Gains of Arbitration During the Past Year.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

Address at the opening session of the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 20, 1908.

It is not easy to separate the subject of arbitration from other lines of peace work and consider it by itself. Work for arbitration is only one section of a great movement, all of whose parts interact upon one another, either for better or for worse. Delay in one means more or less delay in all; the advancement of one, the advancement of the whole. The attempt has been made to show that arbitration by itself can be promoted to success, and that when the contest for it is won, all else will follow necessarily, even limitation and reduction of armaments, even though nothing direct in the meantime be done to bring about that result. The past year shows, as one would suppose from the very nature of the problem, that this position is untenable. The power that defeated the proposal for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration at The Hague last summer is, as everybody knows, the greatest military power of Europe. It was likewise the power which steadily refused to allow the subject of limitation of armaments to be even seriously considered. It is practically certain that no power, either Germany or any other, will ever approve of a thoroughly good and satisfactory general system of obligatory arbitration until it is willing to see an agreement go into effect for the arrest of competitive arming.

For the purpose of study, however, and the taking of our bearings on the special limited subject in whose interests we have gathered in this fourteenth Mohonk Conference, arbitration may for the time properly be considered alone.

When our Conference closed here last year it was generally expected by leaders of the arbitration and peace movement in all countries that whatever else the second Hague Conference might or might not do, it would give us a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, to run for a fixed period and to cover a specified number of classes of controversies. Action to this end was strongly urged upon the Conference by the International Peace Congress, by this Conference, by the Interparliamentary Union and many other organizations. This subject was prominent on the program for the Conference put forward by the London meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. The largest single memorial presented to the President of the Hague Conference was a

petition gotten up by Miss Anna B. Eckstein of Boston, in behalf of a general arbitration treaty, and signed individually and representatively by more than two million persons. In spite, however, of this strong moral pressure and of the positive support of many of the governments themselves, the Conference, because of the opposition of a small group of states led by Germany, failed to prepare and recommend such a treaty.

But this failure to reach a positive result does not mean that the principle of obligatory arbitration was not materially advanced at the Conference. On the contrary, one of the greatest results was the advancement of this subject a long way toward final solution. More than four-fifths of the delegations voted for a treaty of this type, and even Germany, which refused to give her approval to such a treaty, declared that she was in favor of obligatory arbitration, as she had shown by entering into a treaty of this nature with one or two of the powers. But she declared herself unwilling to enter into a general agreement which would include among its signatories some of the less advanced nations.

Besides this approval of the principle of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration by so large a majority of the Conference, the cause of arbitration was advanced by its action in several other directions. The first of these was the revision and strengthening of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes adopted at the first Hague Conference. This Convention was enlarged from sixty-one to ninety-seven articles and improved in important respects. The Permanent Court of Arbitration has, therefore, the increased prestige given by the approval of the second Hague Conference and by the admission as parties to it of all the nations which were not represented at The Hague in 1889. It has become, therefore, a real world arbitration court.

The procedure of the Court was also improved in certain respects, into whose details it is not necessary here to go.

One of the most important ways in which arbitration was advanced and strengthened was the insertion in Article 48, on the suggestion of the Peruvian delegation, with the approval of the United States representatives, of a provision that in case one of two disputing nations should desire to have the case arbitrated and the other party should hesitate or be unwilling to do so, the first party might go directly to the Bureau of the Hague Court and declare its wish to have the controversy referred to the Court. The opinion of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, as of the United States delegates and other important members of the Conference, that this provision will make it practically impossible for any nation to refuse to arbitrate a controversy, when it is asked to do so before the public opinion of the world, is, it seems to me, entirely right. The provision, of course, does not make it possible for a nation to compel its opponent to appear before the bar of the Court, but the request for arbitration in this open, public way will probably in practice have the same results. The united moral power of the governments of the world is now in a position to accomplish almost any desired end.

In the matter of the collection of debts claimed to be due from one government to the citizens of another, the action of the second Hague Conference has also greatly